UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,419	07/12/2001	Scott Kauffman	05348.00001	3560

22909 7590 02/27/2003

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER
PREVIL, DANIEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2632	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,419	KAUFFMAN, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel Previl	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-67* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-67* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haeri (US 5,659,290).

Regarding claim 1, Haeri teaches a magnet 28; a mount that attaches the magnet to a vehicle (the magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 2, Haeri teaches the vehicle is selected from a group consisting of : a motorcycle, an automobile and a bicycle (col. 1, lines 19-23).

Regarding claim 3, Haeri teaches the magnet is a permanent magnet (col. 3, lines 57-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haeri.

Regarding claim 4, Haeri discloses all the limitations in claim 1 but fails to specify a group consisting of: a ceramic magnet, a neodymium-iron-boron magnet, a samarium-cobalt magnet, and a magnet formed of an alloy of aluminum, nickel, and cobalt. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 5, Haeri discloses all the limitations in claim 1 but fails to specify that the magnet is a grade 5 ceramic magnet. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 6, Haeri discloses all the limitations in claim 1 but fails to specify that the magnet has a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 7, Haeri discloses all the limitations in claim 1 but fails to specify a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a

coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 8, Haeri discloses the magnet is an electromagnet (electrical pulses generated from magnetic reed sensor 18 which are caused when magnets 28 attached to drive shaft 30) (col. 4, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 9, Haeri discloses the magnet includes a protective coating (magnets using an adhesive or plastic sleeve) (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 10, the examiner takes the official notice that "a conducting material" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 11, the examiner takes the official notice that " tin, nickel or chrome" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 12, Haeri discloses a non-conductive material (plastic) (col. 4, lines 2-12).

Regarding claim 13, Haeri discloses the coating is formed from plastic (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 14, Haeri discloses an adhesive material (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 15, Haeri discloses adhesive coating on two opposing surfaces (adhesive on both sides) (col. 1-12).

Regarding claim 16, Haeri discloses the mount includes a corrugated tie (attaching the magnets using a piece of plastic tape containing an adhesive on both sides) (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 17, Haeri discloses the mount is integrally formed with the vehicle (magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

4. Claims 18-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haeri (US 5,659,290) in view of Clark (US 4,568,937).

Regarding claim 18, Haeri discloses a magnet 28; a mount that attaches the magnet to a vehicle (the magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Haeri discloses every feature of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose moving the vehicle proximal to an inductance loop of the inductance loop vehicle detector.

However, Clark discloses the step of moving the vehicle proximal to an inductance loop of the inductance loop vehicle detector (the vehicle is leaving the loop inductance) (col. 6, lines 60-68; col. 2, lines 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Clark in Haeri. Doing so would detect accurately the presence of vehicle within the field of the

induction loop to avoid collision that may lead to property damage and personal injury.

Regarding claim 19, Haeri teaches the magnet is a permanent magnet (col. 3, lines 57-58).

Regarding claim 20, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 18 but fails to specify a group consisting of: a ceramic magnet, a neodymium-iron-boron magnet, a samarium-cobalt magnet, and a magnet formed of an alloy of aluminum, nickel, and cobalt. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 21, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 18 but fails to specify that the magnet is a grade 5 ceramic magnet. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and

aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 22, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 18 but fails to specify that the magnet has a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 23, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 18 but fails to specify a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic

metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 24, Haeri discloses the magnet is an electromagnet (electrical pulses generated from magnetic reed sensor 18 which are caused when magnets 28 attached to drive shaft 30) (col. 4, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 25, Haeri discloses the magnet includes a protective coating (magnets using an adhesive or plastic sleeve) (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 26, the examiner takes the official notice that "a conducting material" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 27, the examiner takes the official notice that " tin, nickel or chrome" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 28, Haeri discloses a non-conductive material (plastic) (col. 4, lines 2-12).

Regarding claim 29, Haeri discloses the coating is formed from plastic (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 30, Haeri discloses the magnet is attached using a mount (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 31, Haeri discloses an adhesive material (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 32, Haeri discloses adhesive coating on two opposing surfaces (adhesive on both sides) (col. 1-12).

Regarding claim 33, Haeri discloses the mount includes a corrugated tie (attaching the magnets using a piece of plastic tape containing an adhesive on both sides) (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 34, Haeri discloses the mount is integrally formed with the vehicle (magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 35, Haeri discloses a the step of manufacturing a vehicle (col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-12); attaching the magnet to a vehicle (the magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Haeri discloses every feature of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose activating proximal inductance loop detectors.

However, Clark discloses the step of moving the vehicle proximal to an inductance loop of the inductance loop vehicle detector (the vehicle is leaving the loop inductance) (abstract; col. 7, lines 33-37; col. 6, lines 60-68; col. 2, lines 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Clark in Haeri. Doing so would detect accurately the presence of vehicle within the field of the induction loop to avoid collision that may lead to property damage and personal injury.

Regarding claim 36, Haeri teaches the magnet is a permanent magnet (col. 3, lines 57-58).

Regarding claim 37, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 35 but fails to specify a group consisting of: a ceramic magnet, a neodymium-iron-boron magnet, a samarium-cobalt magnet, and a magnet formed of an alloy of aluminum, nickel, and cobalt. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from ceramic magnet,

neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 38, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 35 but fails to specify that the magnet is a grade 5 ceramic magnet. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 39, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 18 but fails to specify that the magnet has a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a total flux of

at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 40, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 35 but fails to specify a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 41, Haeri discloses the magnet is an electromagnet (electrical pulses generated from magnetic reed sensor 18 which are caused when magnets 28 attached to drive shaft 30) (col. 4, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 42, Haeri discloses the magnet includes a protective coating (magnets using an adhesive or plastic sleeve) (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 43, the examiner takes the official notice that "a conducting material" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 44, the examiner takes the official notice that " tin, nickel or chrome" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 45, Haeri discloses a non-conductive material (plastic) (col. 4, lines 2-12).

Regarding claim 46, Haeri discloses the coating is formed from plastic (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 47, Haeri discloses the magnet is attached using a mount (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 48, Haeri discloses an adhesive material (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 49, Haeri discloses adhesive coating on two opposing surfaces (adhesive on both sides) (col. 1-12).

Regarding claim 50, Haeri discloses the mount includes a corrugated tie (attaching the magnets using a piece of plastic tape containing an adhesive on both sides) (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 51, Haeri discloses the mount is integrally formed with the vehicle (magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 52, Haeri discloses a the step of attaching the magnet to a vehicle (the magnets 28 can be attached to the vehicle using an adhesive) (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Haeri discloses every feature of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose activating inductance loop detectors proximal to the vehicle.

However, Clark discloses the step of moving the vehicle proximal to an inductance loop of the inductance loop vehicle detector (the vehicle is leaving the loop inductance) (abstract; col. 7, lines 33-37; col. 6, lines 60-68; col. 2, lines 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Clark in Haeri. Doing so would detect accurately the presence of vehicle within the field of the induction loop to avoid collision that may lead to property damage and personal injury.

Regarding claim 53, Haeri teaches the magnet is a permanent magnet (col. 3, lines 57-58).

Regarding claim 54, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 52 but fails to specify a group consisting of: a ceramic magnet, a neodymium-iron-boron magnet, a samarium-cobalt magnet, and a magnet formed of an alloy of aluminum, nickel, and cobalt. Since, Haeri discloses a non

magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from ceramic magnet, neodymium-iron-boron magnet and samarium-cobalt magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 55, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 52 but fails to specify that the magnet is a grade 5 ceramic magnet. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the magnet from a grade 5 ceramic magnet in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 56, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 52 but fails to specify that the magnet has a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e. Since, Haeri

discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a total flux of at least 20,000 maxwells and a maximum energy product of at least 6.5 MGO_e in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 57, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 52 but fails to specify a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds. Since, Haeri discloses a non magnetic metal sleeve 20 for example, copper and aluminum (col. 3, lines 15-20). It is well known in the art for the magnet to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment. So it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a residual induction of at least 3000 gauss, and a coercive force of at least 2200 oersteds in order to ensure a clean atmosphere performance that is unaffected by dust, corrosion, moisture in the environment.

Regarding claim 58, Haeri discloses the magnet is an electromagnet (electrical pulses generated from magnetic reed sensor 18 which are caused when magnets 28 attached to drive shaft 30) (col. 4, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 59, Haeri discloses the magnet includes a protective coating (magnets using an adhesive or plastic sleeve) (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 60, the examiner takes the official notice that "a conducting material" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 61, the examiner takes the official notice that " tin, nickel or chrome" is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 62, Haeri discloses a non-conductive material (plastic) (col. 4, lines 2-12).

Regarding claim 63, Haeri discloses the coating is formed from plastic (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 64, Haeri discloses the magnet is attached using a mount (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 65, Haeri discloses an adhesive material (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 66, Haeri discloses adhesive coating on two opposing surfaces (adhesive on both sides) (col. 1-12).

Regarding claim 67, Haeri discloses the mount includes a corrugated tie (attaching the magnets using a piece of plastic tape containing an adhesive on both sides) (col. 4, lines 1-12).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lees (US 6,345,228) discloses a road vehicle sensing apparatus and signal processing apparatus therefore.

Riesenberg et al. (US 3,949,252) discloses a vehicle wheel rotation speed measuring system.

Prohaska (US 5,201,111) discloses a method of manufacturing an electric motor.

Gebert et al. (US 5,396,234) discloses a validation checking in traffic monitoring equipment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Previl whose telephone number is 703 305-

1028. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel WU can be reached on 703 308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9314 for regular communications and 703 872-9315 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305-4700.

Daniel Previl
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

DP
February 10, 2003

DANIEL J. WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/12/03